

TIKKA -- Appln. No. 09/402,646

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 1-9 are amended merely for clarity and for better compliance with current U.S. practice, and no new matter is presented hereby. Claims 1-9 are pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application based on the following remarks are respectfully requested.

The Office Action indicated that an abstract on a separate sheet is required. Applicant has enclosed an abstract on a separate sheet as required.

Claims 4, 5 and 7-9 were objected to for various informalities. Applicant has amended the claims to address the noted informalities and to place the claims in even better compliance with current U.S. practice, and Applicant submits that the objection is overcome.

Claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for allegedly being indefinite. Applicant has amended the claims to address the noted recitations, and Applicant submits that the § 112 rejection is overcome.

Claims 1, 2 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) over Suvanén et al. (WO 96/42142). Applicant traverses the rejection because Suvanén et al. fails to disclose, teach or suggest all the features recited in the claims.

For example, Suvanén et al. fails to disclose, teach or suggest a method of controlling the load in a mobile communications system including transmitting a control signal via a radio path to at least one mobile station for regulating its parameters related to discontinuous transmission in such a manner that the at least one mobile station transmits telecommunication signals to the system more seldom or more often, as recited in independent claim 1 and its dependent claim 2. Similarly, Suvanén et al. fails to disclose, teach or suggest a mobile station including regulation means, responsive to detection means (for detecting a predetermined control signal) for changing parameters utilized in speech detection in such a manner that signal processing means interprets voice signals received through a user interface as background noise more seldom or more often, as recited in independent claim 9.

To the contrary, Suvanén et al. is merely directed to a mobile station which is commanded to use a discontinuous transmission (DTX) mode, but fails to teach or suggest the use of the claim-recited control signal which affects parameters regarding how the DTX should be implemented (*i.e.*, whether signals should be transmitted more seldom or more often). For example, on page 14, lines 4-12, Suvanén et al. discloses that a mobile station may be commanded into a DTX mode, and the voice activity detection block (VAD) 25 finds

TIKKA -- Appln. No. 09/402,646

our whether the speech parameters of the microphone signal contain speech or mere background noise. In contrast to the claim-recited control signal for regulating parameters related to DTX, or the claim-recited regulation means for changing the parameters utilized in speech detection, Suvanen et al. merely discloses that the VAD function is defined in GSM recommendation 6.32, and that it is mainly based on analyzing energy and spectral changes of the signal. Suvanen et al. discloses that it is sufficient to command a mobile station to implement DTX, but such implementation is always in the same, fixed way using the same fixed parameters. Suvanen et al. does not teach that it is possible to transmit a control command to the mobile station which regulates the parameters used by the mobile station in implementing the DTX.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Suvanen et al. does not disclose a method or system, including regulating parameters related to discontinuous transmission, such that the mobile station transmits telecommunication signals more seldom or more often, or such that signal processing means interprets voice signals as background noise more seldom or more often, as recited in the rejected claims. Thus, the rejection is traversed, and Applicant submits that claims 1, 2 and 9 are allowable.

Claims 3-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Suvanen et al. in view of Kokko et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,790,534). Applicant traverses the rejection because the combined teaching of Suvanen et al. and Kokko et al. fails to disclose, teach or suggest all of the features recited in the rejected claims.

As explained above, Suvanen et al. fails to disclose, teach or suggest a method including transmitting a control signal for regulating parameters related to discontinuous transmission such that at least one mobile station transmits telecommunication signals to the system more seldom or more often, as recited in independent claim 1 and its dependent claim 3. Similarly, Suvanen et al. fails to disclose, teach or suggest a mobile communication system including mobile stations with regulations means for regulating parameters of the mobile stations related to discontinuous transmission in response to receiving a control signal such that the mobile stations transmit telecommunication signals to other parts of the system more seldom or more often, as recited in independent claim 4 and its dependent claims 5-8.

Kokko et al. fails to remedy the deficiencies of Suvanen et al. Kokko et al. merely discloses, in column 7, lines 57-59, that "the BS 14 [base station] may place MS 12 [mobile station] into a discontinuous transmission (DTX) mode of operation." However, Kokko et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest the claim-recited control signal for regulating parameters,

TIKKA -- Appln. No. 09/402,646

or that parameters related to DTX are regulated such that the mobile station transmits signals more seldom or more often, as recited in independent claim 1 and its dependent claim 3, and as recited in independent claim 4 and its dependent claims 5-8.

Therefore, Applicant submits that the combined teaching of Suvanen et al. and Kokko et al. does not disclose a method or system for regulating parameters of the mobile stations related to discontinuous transmission in response to a control signal such that the mobile stations transmit more seldom or more often, as recited in the rejected claims. Thus, the rejection is traversed, and Applicant submits that claims 3-8 are allowable.

In view of the foregoing, the claims are now believed to be in form for allowance, and such action is hereby solicited. If any point remains in issue which the Examiner believes may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP

By: _____

Christine H. McCarthy

Reg. No.: 41,844

Tel. No.: (703) 905-2143

Fax No.: (703) 905-2500

CHM/ASW/smm
1600 Tysons Boulevard
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 905-2000